UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,327	09/29/2003	Peter Lang	2058.233US1	4654

50400   7590   07/03/2008
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
SANDERS, AARON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-16* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 April 2008* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 4 April 2008 has been entered. Claims 1 and 3-16 are pending.

Claim 1 is currently amended. Claims 2 and 17-33 are cancelled. No claims are new. This

action is FINAL, as necessitated by amendment.

Drawings

The amendment to the drawings filed 4 April 2008 is objected to because it introduces

new matter into the disclosure. Specifically, the step "make the association of the first identifier

with the first field and the association of the second identifier with the second field available for

data processing activities" appears to be new matter.

Specification

The amendment to the specification filed 4 April 2008 is objected to under 35

U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that

no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added

material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "The method 2000 then

includes making 2012 the association of the first identifier with the first field and the association

of the second identifier with the second field available for data processing activities." Applicant

is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Objections

As per claim 1, it is not clear how making "the association of the first identifier with the first field and the association of the second identifier with the second field available for data processing activities" excludes "the first user of group of users from the first activity and the second user or group of users from the second activity." There appears to be an essential step missing, since making data available does not require that it be used.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1 and 3-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The disclosed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomena) since it fails to produce a tangible result.

As per claims 1 and 3-16, the disclosed subject matter does not produce a tangible result because it fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulation of data. Specifically, the disclosed subject matter provides for making the association between the identifiers and fields available for data processing activities. This result is not defined in the specification, thus it is unknown if making these associations "available" requires the tangible result of sending them to another system or presenting them to a user. The

result remains in the abstract and, thus, fails to achieve the required status of having real world

value.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Powers et al., U.S. 6,901,426 (Powers), in view of Hansen et al., U.S. 6,886,016 (Hansen).

1. Powers teaches "*A computer program product, tangibly embodied in one ore more*

information storage devices, for tailoring the storage of information, the computer program

product comprising instructions operable to cause one or more data processing apparatuses to,"

see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 29-40, "In this way, access privileges may be easily updated and

maintained for the user in response to changes in allowed services or organizational structure."

Powers teaches "*a first field to be included in the tailored object class definition,*" see

Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID,

a second field identifies a level or member associated with the user by the level or member ID,"

where the claimed "first field" is, for example, a referenced "second field" with the value

"company."

Powers teaches "*a second field to be included in the tailored object class definition,*" see

Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID,

a second field identifies a level or member associated with the user by the level or member ID,"

where the claimed "second field" is, for example, a referenced "second field" with the value

"Sales Group."

Powers teaches "*a first user or group of users,*" see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the

user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID," where the claimed "first user" is,

for example, "User 10."

Powers teaches "*and a second user or group of users,*" see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61,

"In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID," where the claimed "second

user" is, for example, "User 35."

Powers teaches "*tailor the object class definition to include the first field and the second*

field," see Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 21-31, "The user view table 140 may be manually populated by

the system administrator or other user having suitable access privileges or may be generated

based on the organizational structure defined by the organization tables 82."

Powers teaches "*associate a first identifier with the first field to identify that the first user*

or group of users is to be excluded from a first activity that involves the first field," see Fig. 4 and

col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID, ... and a

fourth field enables the stored association between a user and a level or member in the user's

view," where the claimed "first identifier" is the referenced "N" in the "Allowed" column of

"User 10's" "Company" field.

Powers teaches "*associate a second identifier with the second field to identify that the*

second user or group of users is to be excluded from a second activity that involves the second

field," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user

by user ID, … and a fourth field enables the stored association between a user and a level or

member in the user's view," where the claimed "first identifier" is the referenced "N" in the

"Allowed" column of "User 35's" "Sales Group" field.

Powers teaches "*and make the association of the first identifier with the first field and the*

association of the second identifier with the second field available for data processing activities

to exclude the first user of group of users from the first activity and the second user or group of

users from the second activity," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 29-40, "The privilege tables 84 assign

each user a view and a class of services. The view specifies the levels and members of an

organizational structure to which the user is allowed access… The user has access privileges to

perform services within the user's class of services for levels and members within the user's

view. In this way, access privileges may be easily updated and maintained for the user in

response to changes in allowed services or organizational structure."

Powers does not explicitly teach "*present a user with options for tailoring an object class*

definition." Hansen does, however, see Figs. 2, 2A, and col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 5, "Next, in

step 106, the user [selects] a plurality of attributes associated with the index class. As shown in

FIG. 2A, the user can select from a list of available or existing attributes (key fields) 170," where

the claimed "object class definition" is the referenced "index class." Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine the

teachings of the cited references because Hansen's teachings would have allowed Powers'

method to gain the ability to create or modify an object class, see col. 4, lines 31-41.

Powers does not explicitly teach "*receive user input for tailoring the object class*

definition in response to the presentation of options, the user input identifying." Hansen does,

however, see Fig. 2A and col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 5, "Thus, in FIG. 2A, the user has defined

the index class Patient." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

database art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because

Hansen's teachings would have allowed Powers' method to gain the ability to create or modify

an object class, see col. 4, lines 31-41.

3. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions*

cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying a role that

the first user or group of users plays in an operation," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the

user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID, … a third field identifies whether

the item in the second field is a level or a member," where the claimed "role" is the referenced

"member."

4. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 3, wherein the instructions*

cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to associate an identifier of the role with the

first field," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a

user by user ID, … a third field identifies whether the item in the second field is a level or a

member," where the claimed "identifier" is the referenced "M."

5. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions*

cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying a fieldgroup

that includes the first field," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 29-40, "In this way, access privileges

may be easily updated and maintained for the user in response to changes in allowed services or

organizational structure."

6. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: receive first user input identifying the first field and the second field from a first individual*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 29-40, "In this way, access privileges may be easily updated and maintained for the user in response to changes in allowed services or organizational structure."

Powers teaches "*and receive second user input identifying the first user or group of users and the second user or group of users from a second individual*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 29-40, "In this way, access privileges may be easily updated and maintained for the user in response to changes in allowed services or organizational structure."

7. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying the first activity from which the first user or group of users is excluded*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID, ... and a fourth field enables the stored association between a user and a level or member in the user's view," where the claimed "first activity" is the referenced "Company."

8. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 7, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying an authorization level identifying the first activity*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID, ... and a fourth field enables the stored association between a user and a level or member in the user's view," where the claimed "authorization level" is the referenced "Y" or "N."

9. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 8, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input selecting the authorization level from a group of at least four authorization levels*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID, ... and a fourth field enables the stored association between a user and a level or member in the user's view," where the claimed "authorization level" is the referenced "Y" or "N."

11. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: receive user input identifying an operation performed with the tailored object*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 29-40, "In this way, access privileges may be easily updated and maintained for the user in response to changes in allowed services or organizational structure."

Powers teaches "*and associate an operation identifier, the first identifier, and the first field to indicate that the first user or group of users is to be excluded from the first activity that involves the first field in the operation*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID, ... and a fourth field enables the stored association between a user and a level or member in the user's view," where the claimed "first identifier" is the referenced "N" in the "Allowed" column of "User 10's" "Company" field.

12. Powers teaches "*The computer program product of claim 11, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying a collaboration of at least two parties*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID, ... a third field identifies whether the item in the

second field is a level or a member," where the claimed "collaboration" is indicated by the

referenced "M."

13. Powers does not teach *"The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the*

instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to instantiate the tailored

object class definition." Hansen does, however, see Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 41-56, "FIG. 2 is a

flow diagram illustrating a process 100 by which the user creates an index class and defines its

attributes according to a preferred embodiment of the present invention." Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine

the teachings of the cited references because Hansen's teachings would have allowed Powers'

method to gain the ability to create or modify an object class, see col. 4, lines 31-41.

14. Powers teaches *"The computer program product of claim 1, wherein: the first activity*

comprises display of contents of the first field," see Fig. 4.

Powers teaches *"and the second activity comprises display of contents of the second*

field," see Fig. 4.

15. Powers does not teach *"The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the*

instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to create a graphical user

interface to lead a user through the tailoring." Hansen does, however, see Fig. 2A. Thus, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention

to combine the teachings of the cited references because Hansen's teachings would have allowed

Powers' method to gain the ability to create or modify an object class, see col. 4, lines 31-41.

16. Powers teaches *"The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the instructions*

cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to create the graphical user interface on a

web browser," see col. 3, lines 12-19, "The client space 12 includes a web-browser 30 having a

graphical user interface (GUI) 32. The graphical user interface 32 displays web pages 34

downloaded over the network 22 from the server application space 14."

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powers et al.,

U.S. 6,901,426 (Powers), in view of Hansen et al., U.S. 6,886,016 (Hansen), and further in view

of Keinsley et al., U.S. 2003/0154403 (Keinsley).

10. Powers does not teach "*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the*

instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: identify a trigger."

Hansen does, however, see Fig. 2A, where the claimed "trigger" is the referenced changing the

Access List from "ACLPUBLIC" to another option in the drop down menu. Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to combine

the teachings of the cited references because Hansen's teachings would have allowed Powers'

method to gain the ability to create or modify an object class, see col. 4, lines 31-41.

Powers and Hansen do not teach "*and based upon the identification of the trigger, end*

the association of the first identifier with the first field to indicate that the first user or group of

users is no longer excluded from the first activity." Keinsley does, however, see ¶ 561,

"Reinstate a User is equivalent to Register a User, where an existing user account is being used,

where the user has been previously registered with the entity, and the status is Revoked. This

results in reregistered and active status records being set up for the entity-user." Thus, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to

combine the teachings of the cited references because Keinsley's teachings would have allowed

Hansen and Olds' method to gain the ability to reinstate a user after a suspension, see ¶ 561.

Response to Arguments

As per Applicant's argument that claims 1 and 3-16 are statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101,

the Examiner respectfully disagrees. While the object class definition may be useful "to exclude

the first user of group of users from the first activity and the second user or group of users from

the second activity," it is not clear that this is the result of the method. If it is the result, it would

likely be tangible. There is a missing step, however, between making the associations of the

identifiers and the fields available and excluding users from activities. This step does not appear

to be filled by the specification, since it does not mention making the associations available.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 1 and 3-16

have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Specifically,

Powers teaches, for example, "*a first user or group of users*," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61,

"In the user view table 140, a first field identifies a user by user ID," where the claimed "first

user" is, for example, "User 10." Powers also teaches "*associate a first identifier with the first*

field to identify that the first user or group of users is to be excluded from a first activity that

involves the first field," see Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 47-61, "In the user view table 140, a first field

identifies a user by user ID, ... and a fourth field enables the stored association between a user

and a level or member in the user's view," where the claimed "first identifier" is the referenced

"N" in the "Allowed" column of "User 10's" "Company" field.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Sanders whose telephone number is 571-270-1016. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00a-4:00p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron Sanders/
Examiner, Art Unit 2168
25 June 2008

/Sathyanarayan Pannala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164